

SECRET

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCESMETHODSEXEMPTION 3820
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

3 June 1963

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting with Yurij KESSACH

1. A meeting between Subject and ABCASSO/NY/2 took place in the home of A/4 on 1 May 1963 (from 4:15 to 8:45 p.m.) with A/4 and Volodymyr KHANULA (aka: CHANULA) present. A/4 and Subject were schoolmates in Lvov. KHANULA, through whom the meeting was arranged at the request of Subject, is an old friend of Subject.

2. When Subject arrived at the home of A/4, he seemed tense and uneasy. However, as the conversation progressed, he relaxed somewhat. Subject appeared physically rundown, tired and nervous, as though he were under some pressure of performing tasks for which he is not suitable. He chain-smoked and drank everything offered to him during the course of the visit in A/4's home. The conversation was carried on between Subject and A/2 with only occasional comments by A/4 and KHANULA.

3. (Some information submitted by A/2 on KHANULA: Born about 1909 near Lvov. Studied engineering in Danzig. A/2 has known him and his wife f/w DUEKO for the past 30 years. DUEKO's brother is believed to be a Soviet agent in the USSR, and had been a Polish agent prior to WWII. According to DUEKO, her family has disowned him and wants nothing to do with him. In about 1959 a letter written by the brother was published in the Return to the Homeland newspaper. A/4 and KHANULA are friends.)

4. Topics of Discussion: Subject said he considered it was time for A/2's group to start a "dialogue" with Soviet Ukrainians. He mentioned the names of KYZYA, Goshar, Tsurkan (members of the Ukrainian delegation to the UN) whom he claimed to know personally and who he told A/2 were "no lesser Ukrainian patriots than you". He said he felt certain they were ready for such conversations. The only questions remaining are whether such talks should be held using Subject and the journal, Za Sinen Oknom as intermediaries, whether to organize a special club for this purpose, or whether to hold the conversations in private. A/2 said he was in favor of such talks and mentioned that up to the present time there has only been a monologue conducted from their (A/1's) side. If the other side is ready for discussions and "dialogue", then it would be better to start them privately and eventually find other means for the future. A/2 said that arrangements should be made for such talks and the other side should not take advantage of the meetings before hand for propaganda purposes.

SECRET

SECRET

- 2 -

Subject assured A/2 that Kyzya and others are prepared to undertake such talks. He said they are Ukrainian patriots who fought under red, not blue and yellow banners. Subject said he had opportunity to talk with more than 15 Soviet Ukrainian writers and economists and found that they were all Ukrainian patriots. (He mentioned the names of DIMITREKO, GONCHAR, MEL'NYCHUK.) A/2 agreed that among these men there also are Ukrainian Patriots.

KHANGLA asked about the benefit of such talks. "What good is it that Marshall MALYNOVS'KY and others like him are of Ukrainian birth? There were such generals in terrorist times and they served the tsar." Let them defend the Ukrainian position even if in Communist form. To the present time, they serve only Moscow." In reply, Subject merely stated that there presently are 15 Marshalls with Ukrainian names or of Ukrainian birth.

A/2 said he felt such talks would be beneficial regardless of the conditions and the attitude of these people because in addition to the national question regarding which there should be found common aim among both Ukrainian Communist and nationalists, there also are other topics which can be discussed; e.g., the question of atomic war or peace, the attitude of Ukrainians toward the Russian people, the question of formal status for the UkrSSR. Subject emphasized that all Ukrainians from the UkrSSR respect Ukrainian emigres and consider them necessary. He added that emigres have great opportunities for discussions with Soviet citizens because they can bring up such questions as: Why is there no Ukrainian army, no national bank, no postal system? etc. He mentioned that A/1 is doing an important job.

A/2 mentioned that he would be glad to meet with PALAMARCHUK who recently had published an interesting article, "The Ukraine in the International Scene," and that it would be worth exchanging ideas on this subject. A/2 said such a conversation could take place only privately as he realized PALAMARCHUK could not talk with him in his (A/2's) official capacity. Subject agreed with this opinion.

Subject said he knew about past contact of an AKESSHEV representative with one of the former members of the Ukrainian Delegation at the UN who, as a result of this contact, almost got into trouble. He said he considered unnecessary to publish statements about him in the press in the manner in which they were published. Speaking of present members (of the Ukrainian Delegation) he said they consider themselves to be in a stronger position and that there are no "little Russians" among them. (Note: Subject probably was referring to UDOVICHENKO and the article written about him by the A/27.)

Subject brought with him copies of the journals Dalpro and Vitakyza where his novels, a play, and biography were recently published, and also several letters to him from the Ukraine, and a

SECRET

Volynsky Raion newspaper, Prapor Lenina. A/2 said that he had already read the issues of Dnipro and Vitchyzna. Subject said they had shortened his biography somewhat and that it would be a good idea to "correct what they shortened." For example, they left out the part about his father having been a landowner, and other things. He later read excerpts from three letters which he received from Soviet Ukrainian readers of Za Sinen Chasom in which there is only praise, and also a letter from a Ukrainian female in Budapest. He exhibited the newspaper, Prapor Lenina, in which there is published a letter from him to his countrymen, and their letter to him, and also photographs of his contemporaries. A/2 said he was glad that subject clarified certain points in his biography, particularly the fact that Subject had not spent 4 years in a Polish prison. Subject began to explain that he spent almost 3 years under investigation and that when he later escaped abroad, he already was a Soviet Ukrainian sympathizer.

Subject began to talk about his forthcoming trip to the UkrSSR. He said he was planning to go in June of this year. He said he has been invited by the writer, GONCHAR and that he was told he would be able to visit several Ukrainian cities, including Lvov. Subject said that he expects to participate in the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the death of Iasya Ukrainska (he is a nephew of hers), that he will probably present an address about her at one of the universities, and that it is possible the Soviets will publish a collection of his writings while he is there. A/2 said that they (Soviets) probably would not publish all of his works without certain basic changes, he replied, "Undoubtedly not". When it was further stated that his stories in Dnipro were rather weak, he stated that he mailed 15 stories to the Soviet Union from which only three were chosen. Subject said the main reason for his trip to the Ukraine is that he wants to remain there for good. He is tired of editing Za Sinen Chasom and that he is exhausted and tired of everything. He mentioned that he mails about 300 copies of Za Sinen Chasom to the UkrSSR and personally gathers some of the addresses for which subscriptions are paid here. He said he receives about \$85.00 weekly for his work as editor and that "the times of KRUSHCHENIY" are gone when they (the communists) gave larger sums of money. (Note: KRUSHCHENIY used to publish a pro-Soviet Journal Vilna (Windows) in the 30's in Lvov. He later moved with his family to the Eastern Ukraine where he was liquidated in 1934.) Subject was asked whether he thought it was a good idea for him to go to the Ukraine at a time when young Soviet-Ukrainian writers were being attacked. He was told he could be used against them. He said he didn't think the Soviets would use him against the writers.

During the earlier part of the conversation, Subject mentioned that he was being used as a "Medchen fur Alles" and, therefore, he would like to go away to the Soviet Union for good. At present there is no one to take over the editorship of Za Sinen Chasom which he feels it would be good to continue. When it was mentioned that the

Soviets would have a hard time finding a replacement, he said that they could always buy someone.

Asked about the local progressives, Subject said they were idiots, primitive and concerned only about their jobs. He said Mykola TARKIV'S'KY, former editor of Ukrainian Daily Pravda, who went to the Ukraine was an idiot and continues to conduct himself like an idiot.

Subject complained that he was being attacked by the A/1 journal. He was told this was not true and that thus far, silence has been maintained, in spite of the fact that certain damaging facts about him are available. Subject mentioned that he wrote an article in Za Sloboda Osvannia against an A/1 publication because he wanted a vehicle for bringing up the subject of the rehabilitation of KERNOVY. He had been asked to bring up the subject by Soviet Ukrainian writers because they had no opportunity to do it. A/2 agreed with this explanation. Subject praised the A/1 journal and inquired about the number of copies printed.

During the conversation, Subject mentioned that he was interviewed by the PII on eight occasions and that he was able to come out all right because he assured the interviewing official that he was not anti-Semitic, although the official considered all Ukrainians anti-Semitic. He said he also told the PII man he was anti-Chinese because the Chinese are a yellow race. Subject said the official was pleased when Subject told him he never wrote anything against America. Asked whether he had American citizenship, Subject replied that he did.

Subject mentioned that there are many reports made about him to the Ukrainian Delegation at the United Nations that he is an agent of the PII and also that he collaborates with Pravda and to the PII that he is a Soviet agent. He said one of those who report on him is YANOV, a common name, who also "is used by the Jews." Those at the UN treat subject however and tell him about YANOV's reports. Referring to the Subject of talks with Soviet Ukrainians, Subject mentioned PRISUHA and mentioned Subject took to arrange for the meetings between him and A/1 representatives. He agreed that PRISUHA was here for such meetings officially and that on his return he would be obliged to give a full report on the meetings. Subject mentioned the names of LYSTAK-SHUMINSKY and PRASCHY as suitable people for contacts and discussions. When A/2 said that meetings between A/1 people and Soviet Ukrainians couldn't amount to much because there was so much which divided them, Subject said that "apparently you (A/2) are their enemy No. 1".

During the conversation the question of the Ukrainians underground and the UPA was touched upon. Subject replied that "a candle" should have been lit, i.e., something on the order of the Warsaw uprising or the uprising in the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw, as it would have

SECRET

remained a symbol even up to the present time. A/2 said he was against such a "candle" because if would have only meant added bloodshed (Warren uprising). Subject defended his suggestion but neither he nor A/2 clarified whether this "candle" should have been an action against the Soviets or the Germans. However, Subject asked A/2 whether, since he was not in favor of a revolution today, was he in essence in agreement with activities of Soviet Ukrainian patriots such as STEPANIK and others. A/2 replied that he takes a positive stand toward those who engage in positive activities and in activities which benefit the Ukrainian nation. When Subject asked A/2 what he meant, A/2 replied that among Ukrainian Communists there are positive individuals as well.

Subject mentioned L. YANOVSKY of Chicago who he said was trying to obtain permission for the sale in the U.S. of Soviet Ukrainian objects of art. YANOVSKY is a Doyer. He is conducting correspondence with Kiev, making reference to various programs of the Constitution (Soviet Ukraine) in order to get such permission from Kiev and not from Moscow. If he turned to Moscow, he could obtain permission within a month's time but he wants to obtain such permission from Kiev. That is how one must proceed, according to Subject.

Subject also mentioned STEPANIK (or STEPANOVSKY), a Ukrainian from Poland who corresponds with him and writes for Za Sloboda [Free] and who voices his opinion regarding both Ukrainian obriga [life] and the situation in the Ukraine. Subject did not know whether STEPANIK was the son of the formerly well-known STEPANOVSKY in Lvov.

The conversation touched upon former Soviet acquaintances. Subject asked about Volodymyr YATOVY who lives in France and implied why A/1 did not bring him to the United States as very old HANACZIK. He was surprised to hear that HANACZIK had returned to South America. Subject asked whether ANTONOV people met with LAVRINSKED and whether he (LAVRINSKED) still works for the American Committee. He mentioned MATSEVSKY and HORODINSKY and asked why they had discontinued their newspaper, "Yaroslav". Then he discussed his own question by stating that they had written themselves out. Their only recourse was to turn their support to the Soviet Ukraine. In also mentioned Vasyly KUK and the article he wrote in Pravda [Truth] in the Ukraine. When asked about Myron MARTYKO, he replied that he was not even sure whether he was still alive. There was also mention about STEPANIK who spent 18 years in a Soviet concentration camp.

Subject said he thought the discussion should be summed up and at A/2's invitation he suggested as following:

- a. Start dialogue or talks with representatives of the USSR.
- b. Send in articles to Za Sloboda [Free] or supply an editor for the journal.

[TOP SECRET]

SECRET

-6-

c. Establish and register in the U. S. clubs of "Friends of the Ukraine."

The object of these clubs would be to invite guest from the Ukraine (writers, artists, ensembles), give talks, conduct conversations and serve as a basis for contact with representatives of the Ukrainian Delegation at the UN (because as diplomats they cannot appear unofficially). When A/2 asked, "And what in return?", Subject became flustered and stated that he was not appearing here in the role of one fully authorized for discussions, that he was merely airing his own ideas. He became very nervous, leaving statements uncompleted and repeating himself. A/2 replied that in that case it was necessary to talk with those who have full authority. He added that, in his opinion, A/1 will come to this conclusion anyway in about 1-2 years because there would be nothing else left.

In parting (KHANILIA had already left) Subject once again mentioned his trip to the Soviet Union. A/2 stated that nothing could happen there to Subject but that they (Soviets) could use him against Ukrainian nationalism, against America and against abstractionism but that he should be careful, because in the event of war, he would be liquidated. A/2 also suggested that he leave in the West those writings of his which in his opinion would not be published in the Soviet Union because maybe, some day, these writings will be published by the emigration. Subject said he was considering running his writings over to his friends here, and that he does not much care what happens to him. He seemed to genuinely appreciate the advice given to him in this regard.

Additional Information

1. The following day Subject phoned KHANILIA to ask his opinion about the meeting with A/2 and A/4 and invited him to help celebrate his name day (Yuria - 6 May), he told KHANILIA he was very satisfied with the meeting. He mentioned that at first he had been afraid to go. (Note: Subject later postponed the celebration of his name day to 12 May).

2. In Chicago, I. YAREMEO was supposed to have told one of A/2's acquaintances that Subject is seeking a job and wants to turn Za Sinen Oknem over to someone else. He proposed that I. YAREMEO take it over but YAREMEO refused. (Note: To date, in 1965, there have appeared only two issues of Z.S.O., although it is a monthly).

3. V. BOUDYNTCHY on 3 or 4 May informed Myroslava TABOROVY that Subject was planning to visit the Ukraine this summer and rumors that he is working for the FBI could be harmful to him. BOUDYNTCHY said Subject personally told him he was going to the USSR.

SECRET

from AMGASSOWARY/2

JOH - upernihno he zaz jokhohi a minhni strafe do e tenep 15 meppe
zatp minhni Mocri.

John sacryman 6 yhp. onniti habit a komitinti foymi, aye moci John cny
cib i cnykmin blyho tlapet. Kha mok 6yin e hinn posmora i mo boha lacp? Xa
homy motlihi e naxxekhna yhpahman. Tari tlehepan 6yin i sa tlapcbrn x
BX - nrae kha min tolo posa posmora? Mo a tolo, mo manhobcbrn / wapma/ i
-MII nolokvetyca, mo min minn e h yhp. naptiorn. -

John yhp. naptiorn. / srazaa upisanna: Lmtepho, Lohap, Merphnyk. . . /
tyt moknabem posmora i 15 yhp. nincmehhman i ekonomitsam i bci
mavtchin aki 6oponcna naxxekhna a he cnyho-kortu tlapomop. Loco bin wa
JOH meppe cteppakye, mo hnaa ni ihni e totoi ha posmora. John yhp. naptiorn ro.
nepelvachn i syctpien.

i syctpien mornha 6yin ta m06 aptra ctopoha he sunkognctvbaa: nuponarahnri
ix upnabaho i ebehvapho a 6yhyomu shantn ihni foym. Lepelvymora mra posm
moc ctopohn. Kmo aptra ctopoha lotoba ha posmora i "Mizor", to kpmi nolam
MII nneqbmectca sa posmoran i sabbaxye mo moci he 6yba tlpn mohor a he
JOH n xypnay "BOO", an sannikti an a mpolo mndic mra in upnabaho.

posmora. E hntahna tlpn foyminx posmora: an ix blyvyan sa ncepemhunhno
Bralye upisanna: hnaa, Lohap, Lypnah / hnen Mocri YCP tlpn OH/ARX bin shae oc
1. JOH baxke mo hac hem moham mizor, ceto posmora a yhpahman a YCP

----- Tema tlnka posmora:

Posmora a occhomoy bennac mra JOH i MII a upnabaho BX i a nepepman JOH

JOH - ne tarko ctopahn foym i tlmahat i lpoob.

BX - ne mohi tlpn foym i 10 a molo JOH aac-ko-hac yhlyetec
bon nincgci. Ha mohat ycp posmora sacryman, onica aem o tlpn mne ychomotica.
craohn. Ctopace a sacryman ofiuny ihni, aye haclo bin het blyxoxana nax
tngrom i mo sunkohye sannahna kti homy he blymohlarb. Hontihno a nincgci
ho, ne bce mo mohao: honah, bnhn, nno, posmora a posmora n mohin, mo e hi
JOH - mohna qianho shinha, smyeha, lye heposm, kypntp egnepen

B.Xa. upn mohat molo JOH nuponahya a syctpi.

zo 8:45 m. JOH upnby a tolo: 15 i sacra MII i MII a 3a 5 xamnun mpmo m
syctpi a blyvya a mewkhanh JOH a mti i tpaah a up bin tolo: 15 m

o: posmora a syctpi i 10.H.



samnica

5. B posomberi me he noyanty hoti straabe mo bin e "MADAME LAZARES", cedeto nir.
he yymee. e im nospipiohnn i hema monimoo hikoro ha miche pefaktopa "BOO" arnn 6 ymo 6 mo
ha ao becaminx noocnyi i tomy bin xotiba-on anixatn ha caramin nooyt. Bin 6 ym i
e im nospipiohnn i hema monimoo hikoro ha miche pefaktopa "BOO" arnn 6 ymo 6 mo
himpoh bejpekaan. Ha sabbaly, mo nejben in takoro shanayt, bin binuobia, mo oc
tatooho moytib kofoch kyntin.

раси що також подобалося урядовцеві, що він ніколи не писав нічого проти Америки, тощо. /урядовець ФБІ вів розмову з ЮК мабуть в польській мові./ На запит чи має громадянство США відповів позитивно.

9. ЮК згадав також, що на нього є різні доноси до ФБІ як і до місії при ОН, що він мовляв: советський агент, агент ФБІ, а також що він співпрацює з прологос чи МЛ. Одним із тих донощиків є Яблонь який м.тн. доносить і до ФБІ і до МХМК місії при ОН і є звичайна падлюка яким послуговуються також жиди. В місії однаке ЮК довіряють і сказали йому про доноси Яблоня.

Заввага: на тему сплетень про його співпрацю з Прологом ЮК згадував кілька разів в часі розмови.

10. Повернувшись знову до розмов із радянцями, ЮК згадав про підсуху і його землі щодо зустрічі з нами. При тому погодився, що Підсуха був тут на відвідуваннях офіційно і що він про всі розмови повинен позвітувати по повороті. Згадав прізвища: Лисянський та Шеленський які надаються на розмови. На питання що їхні розмови з нами /з МЛ/ ледви чи можуть бути успішні бо нас різнило дуже багато, ЮК відповів що "очевидно ви /МЛ/ є для них чи не ворогом ч. 1". на заввагу що їм буде б тяжко доказати МЛ колаборацію, брак патріотизму, соціальне походження .. ЮК погодився.

11. В розмові порушено також укр.візвольного підпілля й УПА. МЛ згадав що соєвистам не вдається затаїти противімецької боротьби. ЮК відповів, що треба бло зробити "свічку", себто щось в роді польського варшавського повстання а повстання жидівського гетта в Варшаві бо це мало б своє значення й по сьогодні. МЛ висловився проти того рода "свічок" бо це тільки додаткове скривавлення народу /Варшавське повстання/, але ЮК боронив своєї думки при чому ні МЛ ні ЮК не уточнили проти кого мали ми зробити ту "свічку": чи проти німців чи проти більшовиків. В тому ЮК запитав МЛ що якщо він не є ссыгого ні за революцією то тоді він /МЛ/ по сутті погоджується з роботою укр.рад патріотів типу Стефаника і інших. МЛ відповів що він ставиться позитивно до тих які ведуть позитивну роботу і в користь укр.народові. на запит ЮК що МЛ під тим розуміє, він відповів що серед укр.комуністів є позитивні одиниці і вислужники /холуї/. ЮК відповів: "ну! так!"

Якщо йдеться про дальші доцільні зміни в Сов.Союзі й Україні, то ЮК згадав що один із його знайомих з України висловився був що конечно потрібно ще зміни суспільного устрою села.

12. ЮК згадав про І.Яремка з Чікаго який старається дістати представництво продажі укр.виробів з України на терен Америки. Яремко має закінчене право і веде переписку з Києвом покликаючися на різні параграфи конституції УРСР щоб дістати дозвіл з Києва а не Москви. Якщо б він звернувся до Москви

an application, to be examined by the Commissioner in more detail in the Bill.

THE BIRDS WHICH BREASTED A HACI HAD 6 MILES & HAD TO FIGHT, TO GET THEM HOME.

in the hope to gain the support of the American people in the campaign against socialism.

БНГОНБРЫ 60 ИНДИИ МОЖННБОЦИИ НЕ ОЧЕНЬ.

3/ **hōgeninti catarhini "300"** 300 **jarin pētaktopa** **di tēpēōpati** **lēpuk yaphan**,
3/ **3anokinti** **8 CIA** **hūjōn** **tinpaten** **pasatichkori** **yrapati** / **haraa: tpyai yrapati**/
3/ **spēctyari** **ix** **mo** **ohn** **hāyin** **lēpāra** **lēpāra**. **lēpāra** **tin** **hāyin**/
6/ **6 sanpōyari** **lōcten** **3 yrapati** / **higemehniki**, **minhī**, **acawmī**, **•/•**,
7/ **jarati** **jhōbāti**, **sectin** **po3omēn** **ii** **marin** **6a3y** **ana** **syotpihēn** **13** **upēctarahn**.
kamn **VCP** **upn** **OH**, **/6** **ohn** **ak** **minnomēn** **he** **mo3yib** **higemehniki** **hēo3ihihōhō**/
he **sannt** **III** **"a** **mo** **3amihy"** - **10** **no3ehpēyacā** **ii** **no3ae**, **mo** **bin** **lāt** **he**
andcylind **a** **xapērtēpi** **yapōhōbae** **ehōlo** **di** **tepēōpōpō**, **mo** **bin** **higemehniki** **ce3o**
7/ **7/** **10** **no3e** **no3ab**, **mo** **a** **no3o** **no3yimihni** **tin** **cc** ; **2** **pehni** **cati** **higemehniki** **di** **to3o**

3) Mohanlal Maini is a member of the YPCP
and has been:

5. Ha saarhyyehna Hk noora, mo typea uucygmybatn posmaby i ha saamoomehna Mi no-
- • konnua6o6pi.

incitó. De hecho en ese caso se convirtió en un modelo de la teoría de la evolución.

has to be taken to ensure that the new system is fully compatible with the old one.

- B posmobi ioh stralaa me 6ye tipo Cryptomicroto /a6o Cryptomicroto/, ytpaithaa

Dear people of Australia, and the people of America, I hope this message will bring you good news.

дуть другом. ЮК відповів що він думає передати свої твори своїм приятелям тут, а що з ним станеться там, йому вже байдуже. При тому робив враження люди-ни яка щиро приймає поради і вдячна за них.

Додаткові інформації.

1. Наступного дня по зустрічі ЮК телефонував до ВХ питав про враження, запривив його до себе на свої тм'яники / Юрія - 6 травня/ й подав що дуже задоволений з зустрічі й висловлювався позитивно. Згадав при тому що боявся іти на ту зустріч.

заявага: Святкування своїх тм'яників ЮК опісля відложив 12 травня й ВХ ма-
бути піде.

2. В Чікаго І.Яремко мав висловитися до одного з наших знайомих, що ЮК шукає за працею й хоче комусь передати "ЗСО". Пропонував І.Я. але цей відмовивс тому що ЮК журнал зле поставив. ІЯ згадав в розмові що між НК і Прологом є якесь співвідношення.

заявага: досяг за 1963 р появилося тільки два числа "ЗСО" хоча це є місяч-
ник.

3. В.Голубничий 3 або 4 травня поінформував Мирославу що ЮК відіїзджає літом в Україну і що йому може дуже зашкодити поширювання деяким вісток що він /ЮК/ нібито працює для ФБІ. ВГ згадав що вістку про виїзд ЮК в Україну дістав від нього самого.
